



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ing of the name of the noble family of Townshend to which Wolfe's brigadier belonged. "Point Lévis" (p. 248) is the kind of trap the unwary would fall into; the name of the point is Lévi and the adjacent town of Lévis was not so named until after the British conquest of Canada. It is now certain that the Chevalier de Lévis had not 11,000 men (p. 257), or, according to his own account, half that number, in his attack on Quebec in April, 1760. Mr. Thwaites's narrative of the incidents at that period literally teems with inaccuracies. The British retreat after the battle of Sainte Foye was not "orderly" (p. 258) but quite the reverse, for they were pursued pell-mell up almost to the very gates of Quebec. Nor, two weeks later, did Lévis abandon the siege of Quebec because he was attacked (p. 258). He fled in the night in a panic and had got well away before the British knew that he was going.

The most serious fault remains. In modern historical writing the bibliographical apparatus counts for much. Both as a guaranty that the sources of information are adequate, and as a guide to other students, we have the right to expect that here a historical writer will do his best. In the preface Mr. Thwaites suggests that Parkman is a little defective in respect to bibliography, and at the close of the book he places a "Critical Essay on Authorities" which we are to take as superseding Parkman and embodying the best and most recent information. In this essay we have Kingsford's *History of Canada*, in ten volumes, described as "concise" (p. 297). Garneau, the best-known of Canadian historians, is called "Garnier" (p. 297), an offense as great as to call Macaulay Macdonald. "The Haldimand Collection was published in 1884-1885, Bouquet Collection in 1889, Murray Correspondence in 1890", says Mr. Thwaites (p. 298). In fact they fill several hundreds of volumes, and only calendars have been printed. The number of Parkman's volumes relating to New France is given incorrectly (p. 297) as is also that of the *Lévis Documents* (p. 301). A volume by M. René de Kerallain on his ancestor, Bougainville, is cited as if by Bougainville himself (p. 303). Here Mr. Thwaites has fallen before the delusive appearance of the French title-page; the book itself he can hardly have examined. Minor errors in authors' initials and in titles are numerous.

But enough of faultfinding. Summing up, one is obliged to say that, while the book shows industry and knowledge, its faults in regard both to style and to accuracy are so numerous as to make it hardly worthy of the high reputation of its author. The wonder is that these things should have escaped the scrutiny of the alert editor of the series.

GEORGE M. WRONG.

Wolfe and Montcalm. By the Abbé HENRI RAYMOND CASGRAIN.

[The Makers of Canada, in twenty volumes, edited by Duncan Campbell Scott, F.R.S.C., and Pelham Edgar, Ph.D.] (Toronto: Morang and Company. 1905. Pp. xxviii, 296.)

THE death of the Abbé Henri Raymond Casgrain in February, 1904, deprived Canadian literature of a most picturesque and charming per-

sonality; French Canadians of their most devoted and determined champion in the sphere of historical writing; and many individuals of a highly valued friend, whose warm living touch can never be forgotten. The loss of such a man would have been rightly called lamented at any time; happening just when it did, we can only say it was quite as truly lamentable. A little sooner, and his friends would have accepted his last book as coming from what they supposed to be the fullness of knowledge developed by the controversy between Parkman and himself. A little later, and he would have had at his command the result of recent and practically final research in Waddington's *Guerre de Sept Ans*, Doughty's *Siege of Quebec*, and Wood's *Fight for Canada*; and, with this conclusive proof before him, he must have seen the whole vexed question from a point of view far above that of the mere partizan who has to keep worrying the half-knowledge of one side into doing reluctant duty for both. And who knows but that he might have risen to a masterpiece? He had the love of historical research strong within him; an intimate knowledge of the place and people; and the saving grace of a good prose style. And here, at last, he would have had the chance of turning his many advantages to the best account from the completed data. But this was not to be. He had the singular misfortune to have completed his work by the last glimmer of twilight, and to have it posthumously exhibited in the full glare of complete research. A more untoward book was never published.

It may seem ungenerous to criticize adversely the last work of one who is now no more; and we would gladly resign our task. But the editors have assigned to the book a place in a series of volumes which professedly claim to convey the most accurate knowledge of the subjects with which they deal. It therefore becomes our duty to point out how signally the author has failed to give either an adequate or a faithful account of one of the most interesting periods of Canadian history.

The book is unfortunate in being confined almost entirely to the local aspects of the struggle for supremacy. It makes no attempt whatever to correlate the interdependent parts of the world-wide war, with all of which the fate of Canada was intimately bound up. It only relates to sea-power in the most inaccurate and misleading way. It has descriptions of British blue-jackets drilling on shore, and of their being armed to the teeth and ready to swarm over any unprotected part of Montcalm's land defenses in irresistible sheer weight of numbers. But it forgets to say that not one seaman fired a shot or drew his cutlass ashore; and it equally neglects to mention the real determining influences of sea-power which brought about the fall of New France. Anson, who planned the naval action from headquarters, is not named; Wolfe is stated to be in command of Saunders's fleet; and there is complete silence about Hawke's victory in Quiberon Bay which cut the French Atlantic line of communications for good and all and so sealed the fate of Canada.

But even on land, the Abbé hardly ever attempts to appreciate the

situation except from a purely French Canadian point of view. He does not bring the reader up the St. Lawrence with Saunders and Wolfe; he only lets him see the British forces through the estranging "fog of war" which enveloped the foreign invaders during the siege of Quebec.

The long chapter of eighty pages on Wolfe is introduced by the apocryphal account of his behavior at dinner with Pitt and Temple; an account which, even if true, would cast a wholly disproportionate slur on Wolfe's general character. His final victory is ascribed to mere good luck, in spite of the fact that the consummate plan involved the harmonious interworking of many complicated operations by land and water, extending over three days in time; carried out along a front of twenty-nine miles with the utmost secrecy by officers who only knew the parts of it which immediately concerned themselves; and brought to a triumphant conclusion in the dead of night.

But Montcalm fares no better than Wolfe. His victory at Ticonderoga is attributed to Lévis and the French Canadians; though he chose the ground himself and commanded throughout the action in person, and though only one-eighth of his men were Canadians. He gets no credit for having ordered the regiment of Guienne to guard the Foulon on the night before the battle; nor is it mentioned that Vaudreuil withdrew this battalion himself¹ and was solely responsible for leaving that critical point under the care of the scoundrelly Vergor. Bougainville is blamed as much as Montcalm for the loss of the battle; and de Ramesay comes in for the same condemnation for surrendering Quebec.² On the other hand, Lévis is the faultless hero in all things: nothing is said about his mistaken raid along the Mohawk just before Ticonderoga; nor about his urging Montcalm to cross the Montmorency and attack Wolfe in a strongly intrenched position; nor about his great preponderance in numbers at Ste. Foy; nor about his equivocation at Montreal.

Indeed the Abbé appears as the advocate of the French Canadians *contra mundum*. Had he been able to do so with the whole of the evidence before him, he would undoubtedly have left a valuable work of its peculiar kind; because there is a distinctly useful rôle for the advocate in history as in everything else. But the French Canadians lose more than they gain by a championship which is based on injustice to the soldiers of Old France and misrepresentation of their foes. The French Canadians played a heroic part throughout the campaign and especially during the trying days of the siege of Quebec, and their conduct was in marked contrast with the weak, vain-glorious, incompetent

¹ "12. [Septembre, 1759] Mercredi. Ordre donné par M. de Montcalm et ensuite révoqué par M. de Vaudreuil disant nous verrons cela demain, au bataillon de Guyenne d'aller camper au foulon." Journal of Jean-Félix Récher, curé of Quebec, printed in *Bulletin des Recherches Historiques*, May, 1903, Vol. IX., no. 5, p. 139. See also "Correspondance de Bougainville" in Doughty, *Siege of Quebec*, IV.

² See last letter of Montcalm in Wood, *The Fight for Canada*.

governor, whom the Abbé seeks to exalt in the pages of this book. But the recent completion of research has deprived the author's work of its value even from this point of view. The editors have done their best, by writing an elaborate introduction and some very pertinent notes, to bring the book into line with those founded upon a more complete examination of original documents. But the attempt is vain. The final facts now known have put the Abbé's point of view entirely out of focus, even in its own field; while they have brought upon the stage a whole world of action which he never saw at all.

We can only repeat that a more untoward book was never published; and while asking our readers to forget that it was ever written, we would ask them to remember that the Abbé Casgrain wrote it under conditions which absolutely forbade success; that he did far better work in other directions; that his best should be a source of pride and profit to every Canadian, French and English alike, and the man was even better than the best of all his books.

Francis Hopkinson, the First American Poet-Composer, 1737-1791, and James Lyon, Patriot, Preacher, Psalmist, 1735-1794. Two Studies in Early American Music. By O. G. SONNECK. (Washington: Printed for the Author by H. L. McQueen. 1905. Pp. ix, 213.)

It has hitherto been supposed that William Billings was the first American composer of music. In the present volume Mr. Sonneck, chief of the Division of Music of the Library of Congress, throws a flood of light upon the labors of two earlier native musicians, Francis Hopkinson, the poet and friend of Washington, and James Lyon, the patriot, preacher, and psalmist. The amount of musical detail that Mr. Sonneck has unearthed has astonished not only Americans but has found recognition in Germany. It is true that Billings was the first professional composer that our country possessed, but it is here abundantly proved that there were two amateurs in the field before him.

Billings published his first volume of compositions in 1770, while this volume shows that both Hopkinson and Lyon composed some works in 1759, when Billings was but thirteen years old. There is still a little uncertainty as to the exact date of Lyon's earliest composition and as to whether it preceded or succeeded the first musical work of Hopkinson. It is probable that the first American composition was a song, of no very great merit, entitled "My days have been so wondrous free", by Hopkinson, which our author conjectures to have been written in 1759. In 1788 Hopkinson published a set of songs which he dedicated to George Washington. In a letter (given on p. 113) dated November 20, 1788, Hopkinson writes to Washington, saying: "However small the Reputation may be that I shall derive from this Work, I cannot I believe, be refused the Credit of being the first Native of the United States who has produced a Musical Composition." To this